

**Personality and Workplace Ostracism: The value of the HEXACO domains and facets
in predicting ostracizing behaviors in the workplace.**

Uros Jovanovic

549222

Erasmus University Rotterdam

4.5C – Thesis and Internship Psychology

Dr. Jan Luca Pletzer

05.08.2020



Abstract

This study, seeks to examine the relation between personality and workplace ostracizing. Research has shown that workplace ostracism results in negative consequences for all involved. Similarly research has stipulated that ostracism can vary based on individual differences. Limited research however has been conducted on workplace ostracism from a perpetration perspective. We stipulate that specific personality factors are related with the probability of engaging in ostracizing behaviors. We examine and analyze the domain and facet level relations of the HEXACO with workplace ostracizing and investigate the presence of masking and cancellation effects. Among domain level relations we find that Extraversion significantly relates to the probability of workplace ostracizing. We also find evidence that facets are able to outperform their constituent domains when predicting workplace ostracizing. Our findings also revealed masking effects among the Extraversion facets and a cancellation effect within the Honesty-Humility domain. These findings suggest that the use of a few narrow HEXACO facets can be more effective and efficient in predicting workplace ostracizing than the use of all six domains. Ultimately, our findings provide support that investigations of both domain and facet level relations are essential in personality research as criterion related validities are otherwise lost. More research on this topic is required in order to obtain full understanding of the relations between personality and workplace ostracizing.

Keywords: workplace ostracism, ostracizing, personality, HEXACO, masking effects, cancellation effects

Personality and Workplace Ostracism: The value of the HEXACO domains and facets in predicting ostracizing behaviors in the workplace.

Workplace ostracism refers to the experience of being ignored, excluded, and receiving no attention in the workplace whenever practicable and without any explicit explanation. The development of a specific workplace ostracism scale by Ferris et al. (2008) allowed researchers to validly investigate ostracism in the workplace and furthered much research within the broad area of organizational deviance into investigating ostracism. Workplace ostracizing, on the other hand, refers to the focus on those who engage in ostracizing behaviors (e.g., avoiding all contact with a colleague). Ostracism in the workplace is a common occurrence (O'Reilly et al., 2015; Ferris et al., 2017), results in generally negative consequences for those experiencing it (Howard et al., 2019), and negatively relates with performance (Leung et al., 2011). The current predominant focus within research on workplace ostracism, however, has been on the victim's perspective, and little to no research has been conducted from the perpetrator perspective (Howard et al., 2019). As such, there is a disproportionate lack of research and information on workplace ostracizing. Conversely, counterproductive work behaviors (CWB), which may be viewed as comprising of workplace ostracizing behaviors since they are positively related (Zhao et al., 2013), have been a staple of research within organizational psychology for a long time (Lee & Allen, 2002; Dalal, 2005; Rotundo & Spector, 2017; Organ, 2018; Spain, 2019; Pletzer et al., 2020). Similarly, personality has had a predominant focus in organizational psychology, especially within personnel psychology (Hough, 2001; Roberts & Hogan, 2002; Hough & Oswald, 2008; Cook, 2016). Since personality is a strong predictor of counterproductive work behaviors (Jensen & Patel, 2011; Anglim et al., 2018), and given the link between CWB's and workplace ostracizing, it is, therefore, possible that personality may be a predictor of workplace ostracizing as well. The purporting of ostracism has also been argued to differ between people based on individual differences (Jones et al., 2018), further supporting that

the personality of individuals may play a role in determining whether an individual is likely to engage in workplace ostracizing behaviors. We, therefore, set out to examine the relations between the HEXACO personality model and workplace ostracizing.

Moreover, personality, as defined by the HEXACO, is hierarchically organized, meaning that it is structured into broad level domains that are comprised of narrow facets. Thus, we also set out to examine the facet level relations with workplace ostracizing. This will allow us to compare the criterion-related validity (i.e., predictive validity) of the domains and facets in their relation with workplace ostracizing. The examination of facet level relations may also reveal the existence of masking or cancellation effects, which would provide additional clarity on the specific factors of personality that are related with workplace ostracizing, thus further informing our future practices.

Ostracism and Personality

Ostracizing is the behavior that is performed to exclude individuals from social or other interactions or the absence of behavior to include others in activities. An act of ostracism can be ignoring a coworker during meetings, or, for example, excluding a coworker from group interactions. While the effect of ostracism on individuals is widespread and varies based on individual differences (Williams, 2007a; Wesselmann et al., 2012a), it has been stipulated that ostracism results in the experience of pain. According to research, the same regions of the brain, which are activated when experiencing physical pain, are active when experiencing ostracism (Eisenberger, 2012). Research has also shown that ostracism can result in increasing levels of anger and even a loss in ability to self-regulate (Baumeister et al., 2005; Williams, 2007b). Furthermore, it has been suggested that both the perpetration and experience of ostracism results in the loss of a sense of belonging (Nezlek et al., 2015), which can be classified as a negative consequence.

The motivation for ostracizing results from a social control mechanism; that is, individuals are much more likely to ostracize others when those others are perceived as

burdensome or substantially underperforming in comparison to the rest of the group members (Wesselmann et al., 2012b; Rudert et al., 2019). Further to this, individuals are also motivated to exclude others and ostracize them when they break group norms and put the harmony of the group at risk (Rudert et al., 2019). Importantly, research has suggested that individual differences also play a role in predicting whether individuals will engage in ostracizing behaviors. According to Jones et al. (2018), individuals higher in trait mindfulness, for example, are less likely to engage in ostracizing behaviors. Per that trend, this research focuses on what makes individuals more likely to ostracize. In particular, this research focuses on whether personality traits contribute to the probability of ostracizing others at work.

Personality is generally viewed as a combination of traits and characteristics that make up an individual's behaviors, feelings, and ways of thinking (Rogelberg, 2006). There are many different ways in which personality may be defined, for example, through the lexical approach whereby personality is defined based on languages that humans use (Ashton & Lee, 2007). While the Big Five has been the prevailing model of personality for a long time, newer evidence shows that the HEXACO may provide an improved conceptualization of human personality (Ashton & Lee, 2008). This improvement is mainly due to the inclusion of the Honesty-Humility domain, which, besides making the HEXACO stand out as compared to the Big Five in terms of predictive validity, distinguishes it in that no other trait personality model includes such a category within research to date. According to Ashton and Lee (2008), the HEXACO presents the broadest set of personality dimensions that can be consistently found across an array of diverse languages.

Similarly as with the Big Five inventory, personality traits within the HEXACO model are categorized into domains and facets, albeit with a different composition and the additional domain. The HEXACO is comprised of six broad domains which are made up of 24 distinct facets. These six domains, as described by the HEXACO, are Honesty-Humility,

Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience (Ashton & Lee, 2007; Lee & Ashton, 2016). The Agreeableness domain, for example, is comprised of the Forgiveness, Gentleness, Flexibility, and Patience facets. Finally, the HEXACO also includes a 25th interstitial Altruism facet, which loads onto the Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, and Agreeableness domains.

Some research exploring the connection between personality and ostracism has already been conducted (Hitlan & Noel, 2009; Halevy et al., 2014; Rudert, 2019), no research, however, has looked into the role of personality when predicting workplace ostracizing. Moreover, not much research has been conducted using the HEXACO model of personality in either the perspective of the victim or the perpetrator, with the most common personality inventory used to predict workplace ostracism being the Big Five (Howard et al., 2019). This limited use of the HEXACO is an important gap in such research, especially when considering that evidence suggests that the HEXACO model provides a better conceptualization of personality and predicts counterproductive work behaviors better than the Big Five (Ashton & Lee, 2007; Pletzer et al., 2019). To the best of our knowledge, the most recent publication that used the HEXACO with regards to ostracizing behaviors was conducted by Dåderman and Ragnestål-Impola (2019). Nonetheless, the focus of Dåderman and Ragnestål-Impola (2019) was explicitly related to bullying, which, while related to a type of ostracism, is distinct from workplace ostracism. Thus, the investigation of ostracizing behaviors will provide a fuller picture of why it occurs, guide our dealing with its effects on all involved, expand our ways of resolving it, and ultimately help to prevent its occurrence.

Hypotheses & Aims

Honesty-Humility

The honesty-humility domain indicates an individual's propensity to behave fairly and candidly. High scorers avoid the manipulation of others, are disinterested in lavish wealth and luxuries, and do not have an inflated sense of entitlement. Therefore, it stands to reason that

individuals scoring higher on Honesty-Humility might be less likely to engage in ostracizing behaviors compared to those who score low, given that ostracizing is related with the manipulation of others and an increased sense of control over an individual's ability to socialize and interact with others (Nezlek et al., 2015). Moreover, recent findings show that honesty-humility accounts for a significant portion of the variance in delinquent work behaviors (de Vries & van Gelder, 2015). Newer research has also demonstrated that the HEXACO model, with its Honesty-Humility domain, can predict deviant work behaviors better than the Big Five inventory (Pletzer et al., 2019). Since workplace ostracism from a perpetrator perspective is broadly related to workplace deviance, specifically interpersonal deviance (Peng & Zeng, 2016; Jahanzeb & Fatima, 2017), the honesty-humility domain possibly also negatively relates with workplace ostracizing. Similarly, according to Dåderman and Ragnestål-Impola (2019), bullies in the workplace score low on honesty-humility. Therefore, given these conclusions, we propose the following:

Hypothesis 1: Individuals scoring higher on Honesty-Humility are less likely to ostracize others at work.

Agreeableness

The agreeableness domain relates to individuals who are generally cooperative and nonjudgmental. High scorers tend to treat others leniently, compromise with others, forgive wrongdoing, and control their temper easily. On the other hand, those scoring low generally do not forgive easily, are stubborn about their views, criticize the faults of those around them, and become irritable easily. Individuals who are highly agreeable tend to forgive more easily and as such are probably less inclined to ostracize others, especially when considering that ostracizing of others often occurs punitively for wrongdoing or burdensome behaviors (Rudert et al., 2019). Moreover, highly agreeable individuals should be less likely to ostracize others given their propensity to cooperate and compromise with others, an action that is practically impossible when ostracizing the other party. Finally, Dåderman and Ragnestål-

Impola (2019) also found that workplace bullies tended to score lower on Agreeableness. As such, we propose the following:

Hypothesis 2: Individuals scoring highly on Agreeableness are less likely to ostracize others at work.

Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness refers to an individual's propensity to behave in an organized and well-thought-out manner. Those scoring high in Conscientiousness are generally well organized and work in a disciplined and hardworking manner. Such individuals are unlikely to engage in behaviors related to ostracism as these are potentially disruptive to their workflow and overall work environment (Howard et al., 2019). Moreover, highly conscientious individuals deliberate their actions and decisions carefully and are not impulsive. As such, they may realize the negative consequences ostracizing others around them can result in, and thus decide not to engage in such actions. Empirical findings have also found that Conscientiousness is significantly and negatively linked with workplace deviance (de Vries & van Gelder, 2015; Pletzer et al., 2020) which, as aforementioned, is related to workplace ostracizing. Therefore, given that workplace ostracism has many negative consequences for all involved, it follows that individuals high in Conscientiousness are improbable perpetrators of ostracism in the workplace.

Hypothesis 3: Individuals scoring high on Conscientiousness are less likely to ostracize others at work.

Emotionality

The emotionality domain is associated with anxiety, stress, and attachment. Those who score higher on this domain are generally sentimental with others, feel a need for emotional support from others, and experience anxiety as a response to stresses in their life. On the other hand, those who score very low are not unnerved by the possibility of harm, do not worry about stressful situations, and generally feel a low emotional attachment to others.

This domain was not hypothesized to relate with workplace ostracizing as both high scorers, and low scorers would not be expected to engage in such behaviors. An individual who scores higher would not engage in ostracizing behaviors as they would have a need for emotional support from others and would be more empathic and attached to them, all of which would be diminished if they were to ostracize those around them. Similarly, those scoring low on this domain are also not expected to engage in ostracizing others as they most likely would not be phased by those around them, since they would feel more detached from others, would not feel the need to share their concerns with them, and would generally be unbothered by potentially stress-inducing situations (such as a burdensome colleague). Empirically, research on counterproductive work behaviors, which are somewhat related with workplace ostracizing, has found a weak relationship between emotionality and workplace deviance (Pletzer et al., 2020). Given these reasons, we do not expect to find a significant relationship between emotionality and workplace ostracizing.

Extraversion

Extraversion refers to an individual's tendency to feel positive about social interactions. Those scoring high generally enjoy social interactions, are confident about them, and feel good about themselves. On the other hand, low scorers tend to feel indifferent about social interactions, feel less lively, and in general, consider themselves to be unpopular. Facets of this domain may relate differently or not at all with workplace ostracizing due to their different conceptualizations. For example, Sociability is more conceptually related with workplace ostracizing as it specifically relates to social interactions and socializing, whereas the overall domain also includes Liveliness, which is more associated with levels of energy and enthusiasm. Thus, a significant relationship should be present for Sociability but not necessarily for Liveliness too. As such, we did not make a specific hypothesis about a direct correlation between Extraversion and workplace ostracizing as we believe there exists a high potential for cancellation or masking effects. Instead, we focus on its facets and expect that

they will show different results, with certain facets correlating more than others and possibly also in different directions.

Openness to Experience

The openness to experience domain relates to the curiosity of individuals. Those scoring higher, for example, are generally quickly intrigued, inquisitive, and imaginative about many things and people. Workplace ostracizing was not hypothesized to relate with this domain, as ostracizing has a more social foundation, and an individual's curiosity about art, nature, or knowledge would not conceptually relate with it.

Masking & Cancellation Effects

The bandwidth-fidelity dilemma concerns decision-making situations in which there exists a perfect trade-off between the amount of diverse information (bandwidth) and rigorous testing to acquire additional conclusive information (fidelity). This dilemma refers to the trade-off between reliable unidimensional measures versus potentially unreliable multidimensional ones (Judge et al., 2013). Currently, there is no clear consensus on the accepted way to resolve the broad—narrow debate surrounding personality testing. While some research argues that using broad personality traits is better because of higher predictive and criterion-related validities (Ones & Viswesvaran, 1996; Ones et al., 2005), other research suggests that using only broad measures carries a potential risk of masking the possible meaningful relations that exist in the narrower traits (Tett et al., 2003). Similarly, Ashton (1998) argued that only using broad personality dimensions to assess the criteria prevents the exploration of the narrow facets which have the most substantial conceptual and empirical relation to the criteria being researched. According to Ashton (1998, p.301), “optimal prediction of job performance will sometimes require the use of narrow rather than broad personality measures as predictors.” The HEXACO model of personality is also organized hierarchically and consists of domains made up of facets. Recent research has shown, for example, that workplace deviance can be predicted better with the use of a specific narrow

facet of the HEXACO, as opposed to its broad domain (Ashton et al., 2014). Newer research has also affirmed this, and even explored masking and cancellation effects, finding that the fairness facet of the honesty-humility domain was able to explain almost as much variance in workplace deviance as all six domains combined (Pletzer et al., 2020). These are critical advancements since most research has tended to focus only on domain level relations. Therefore, after considering the dilemma, and given recent empirical findings, we believe it is essential to examine facet-level relations because aggregating to the higher-order domain could potentially obscure important facet-level relations.

Given the broader link between workplace deviance and workplace ostracizing, the exploration of the narrow HEXACO facets could prove beneficial in that it may reveal specific facets that can predict workplace ostracizing better than their overall domain. It may also reveal the existence of masking or cancellation effects. In particular, if specific facets are better correlated with workplace ostracizing than the domains they make up, or with other facets, then this would indicate cancellation and masking effects. A full cancellation effect would be present if a domain did not correlate significantly with workplace ostracizing, while one of its facets significantly and positively did, and another correlated negatively. There also exists a contrast that can be made between weak and strong effects. A weak cancellation effect would be present when the domain does not correlate significantly with workplace ostracizing, while one of its facets does. Conversely, to have a weak masking effect, the correlation of a facet with workplace ostracizing should be significantly stronger than the correlation of a second facet, and one of the facets should significantly differ from the domains correlation with workplace ostracizing. Finally, a full masking effect would be present if the correlation of a specific domain with workplace ostracizing were significantly lower than the correlation of a facet, significantly higher than the correlation of another facet, and if the correlation of the first and second facet with workplace ostracizing differed significantly. For example, if facets of the same domain could perform better in predicting

criteria than other facets within that same domain, this would suggest the presence of a masking effect. In other words, a facet such as Fairness (Honesty-Humility), which examines the tendency of an individual to value candor and avoid iniquity, should have a stronger relation to workplace ostracism than the Greed Avoidance facet (Honesty-Humility) which examines an individual's propensity to be uninterested in great wealth and signs of higher social status. Therefore, by exploring these masking and cancellation effects among all HEXACO domains when predicting workplace ostracizing, we are potentially revealing information that would otherwise be lost if we were to only focus on the overall broad predictive validity. Thus, by examining these effects, we may further our comprehension and understanding of the relationship between workplace ostracizing and personality, allowing us to better model organizational practices related to ostracism.

Method

Participants & Procedure

Recruitment of participants was carried out through the dissemination and distribution of a website link that led potential participants to the survey. The link was distributed using the researchers' personal network, social media (e.g., LinkedIn, Instagram, Facebook, et cetera), and in-person recruitment at Erasmus University facilities. The first page of the survey included all relevant ethical information and explanations of the study being conducted. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw and the confidentiality of their responses. Upon proceeding to the survey itself, participants gave their consent for participation and acknowledged their understanding of their rights. 620 individuals accessed the survey. Of those, 433 were removed due to missing data, and incompleteness of the HEXACO and Workplace Ostracizing measures. A further 30 participants were excluded for incorrect attention check completion. Another 32 participants were excluded because of the nature of the study focusing on employed individuals. Finally, 4 participants were excluded due to impossible responses (e.g. Age < Years Employed). The final sample of participants

consisted of 101 individuals. Out of 101 individuals, 71 identified as female, 28 as male, and 2 identified as other. Education of participants was varied with most participants having obtained a Bachelor (N=38) or Master's (N=39) degree. One participant held a Doctorate degree, 7 participants completed some sort of vocational training, while 16 participants had obtained a High School diploma or equivalent. The age of participants ranged from 18 to 58 ($M = 29.14$, $SD = 9.43$) and work experience ranged from less than a year to 42 years ($M = 9.02$, $SD = 8.72$).

Participants completed the self-reports through Qualtrics, an online questionnaire platform. Measures were randomized in the order in which they appeared to participants as a way to control for order effects and confounding variables. The survey was split into two parts, with a one week lag in between, after which the participants were invited to participate in the second part of the survey via the email they provided in the first part. The first part of the survey included the measures of personality and demographic questions. The second part included the rest of the measures, including workplace ostracizing.

Measures

For this study, the measurement of constructs was done through the use of previously validated and reliable instruments. Along with specific construct measurements, demographic information, including age, gender, education level, and employment status, was collected. All measures followed a self-report structure. The data collection for this study was done in conjunction with other Master and Bachelor students and as such included other measurements not described or relevant to this study. These included measures of counterproductive work behaviors, organizational citizenship behavior, the big five inventory, and workplace ostracism (victim).

HEXACO-PI-R

The HEXACO-PI-R 100 item inventory by Lee & Ashton (2016) was implemented. Scale reliabilities were calculated per domain using Cronbach's α , and were above 0.70

indicating good reliability (Honesty-Humility $\alpha = 0.76$, Emotionality $\alpha = 0.79$, Extraversion $\alpha = 0.83$, Conscientiousness $\alpha = 0.87$, Agreeableness $\alpha = 0.78$, and Openness to Experience $\alpha = 0.82$). Reliabilities for facets are included below, in Table 2. A specific item presented to participants was ‘On most days, I feel cheerful and optimistic.’ All items within the HEXACO are statements about the individual completing the inventory. Participants were given a five-point Likert scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) for all 100 items of the HEXACO and asked to respond in accordance with how much they agreed or disagreed with the specific personal statement.

Workplace Ostracizing

For the measurement of workplace ostracizing (workplace ostracism from the perpetrator perspective) an adapted and modified version of the scale developed by Ferris et al. (2008) was utilized ($\alpha = 0.90$). Items concerned behaviors of individuals, such as “I ignored greetings from certain coworkers,” and were rated on a scale from 1 (Never) to 7 (Always).

Data Analysis

Assumption check analyses

Initial exploratory analyses using SPSS revealed significant skew of 2.04 ($SE = 0.24$) and kurtosis of 4.99 ($SE = 0.48$) within data for workplace ostracizing, both of which were corrected with a logarithmic transformation of the workplace ostracizing variable (skewness = 0.98, kurtosis = 0.53). The data of the HEXACO measurements presented no significant skew, kurtosis, or violation of normality according to QQ normality plots and histograms which were used in favor of normality tests such as the Shapiro-Wilk, as these tests tend to be quite sensitive to sample size (Field, 2013).

Main analyses

The main analyses of this study were based on the Pearson correlation coefficient r . For the testing of the hypotheses, a bivariate correlation between the HEXACO domains and

Workplace Ostracizing was carried out using SPSS Statistics. Two linear regression analyses were conducted to compare the explained variance of workplace ostracizing when using the six broad domains or the 24 facets which make them up as predictors. This comparison was done to check if the explained variance was larger for the facets, which would provide additional evidence that important criterion-related variance is lost when aggregating facets to their higher-order domains. Finally, in order to investigate potential masking and cancellation effects, we compare the magnitudes of the correlation coefficients between domains and facets using “cocor,” a statistical correlation comparison software package for R (Diedenhofen & Musch, 2015).

Table 1.

Domain level correlations, means, and standard deviations (N=101)

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Workplace Ostracizing	0.22	0.17							
2. Honesty-Humility	3.62	0.55	-.10						
3. Emotionality	3.34	0.56	-.07	-.17*					
4. Extraversion	3.40	0.57	-.17*	-.11	-.19*				
5. Agreeableness	2.93	0.50	-.03	.11	-.26**	.21*			
6. Conscientiousness	3.70	0.64	-.12	.34**	.03	.13	.06		
7. Openness to Experience	3.54	0.60	.05	.17*	.10	.14	-.03	.03	

Note. *M* and *SD* are used to represent the mean and standard deviation, respectively. Workplace Ostracizing is represented in logarithmic values. * indicates significance at $p < .05$. ** indicates significance at $p < .01$.

Results

The main correlations between the HEXACO domains and Workplace Ostracizing, including those for the hypotheses can be found in Table 1. Agreeableness presented the weakest correlation with workplace ostracizing among the domain level relations ($r = -.03$), while Extraversion had the strongest correlation ($r = -.17$). Conscientiousness and Honesty-Humility were the second and third most correlated domains ($r = -.10$, $r = -.12$, respectively). Among the domains, only Extraversion correlated significantly with Workplace Ostracizing ($p < .05$). Table 2 presents the facet level descriptives and correlations with workplace ostracizing. The strongest correlation of the domain facets were Sociability ($r = 0.21$) and Social Self-Esteem ($r = 0.21$). The weakest correlation among the facet level relations was

Anxiety ($r < .01$). Besides the two facets of the Extraversion domain, Sociability and Social Self-Esteem, the Modesty facet of the Honesty-Humility domain was the only other domain facet that correlated significantly with workplace ostracizing ($p < .05$). A regression analysis using all 24 facets to predict workplace ostracizing revealed more explained variance ($R^2 = .30$) than a regression analysis using all six domains ($R^2 = .06$). Further results of the regressions are presented in Table 3 for the domain level results and Table 4 for the facet level results. All masking and cancellation effects are reported in Table 5. No full masking or cancellation effects were observed. Two weak masking effects, based on 95% confidence intervals, were found for the Extraversion domain. The first masking effect observed was between the Sociability ($r = -.21$) and Social Boldness ($r = .01$) facets. The second effect was found between the Social Self-Esteem ($r = -.21$) and Social Boldness ($r = .01$) facets. Finally, one weak cancellation effect based on the 95% confidence interval was found for the Honesty-Humility domain with the Modesty ($r = -.17$) and Greed Avoidance ($r = .10$) facets. Overall, Altruism, the interstitial facet, had the strongest correlation with workplace ostracizing ($r = -.29$), which was statistically significant ($p = < .01$).

Discussion

The goal of the current study was to explore and investigate the ways in which personality as measured by the HEXACO relates to and with workplace ostracizing. The main aim we set out to achieve was to determine if there was a possibility that certain personality traits or characteristics related to individuals' engagement in ostracizing behaviors at work. Our correlation results indicate that individuals who score higher on Extraversion are less likely to engage in ostracizing behaviors at work as the two correlated negatively and significantly. Extraversion, which was not hypothesized to relate with workplace ostracizing, was the only domain that correlated significantly with workplace ostracizing and as such we do not reject the null hypothesis for all three of our hypotheses. The current study, however, also expands on the usefulness of examining facet level relations when predicting criteria as opposed to the

conventional standard of only exploring domain level relations. This examination of narrow personality facets brings new information on how personality traits may relate with criteria and as such contributes further insights into the value of personality facets. The results underscore the relative importance of facets in predicting criteria and, in the case of workplace ostracizing, generally support that facets are able to outperform their domains.

Table 2.

Facet level reliabilities, correlations, means, and standard deviations (N=101)

	α	M	SD	r	p
Honesty-Humility					
Fairness	0.81	3.71	1.04	-.15	.05
Greed Avoidance	0.72	3.39	0.88	.10	.17
Modesty	0.61	3.80	0.72	-.17	.04*
Sincerity	0.59	3.57	0.76	-.03	.39
Emotionality					
Anxiety	0.67	3.63	0.81	.00	.48
Dependence	0.78	3.06	0.92	-.16	.05
Fear	0.68	3.01	0.87	.08	.23
Sentimentality	0.72	3.64	0.77	-.09	.18
Extraversion					
Liveliness	0.65	3.56	0.72	-.09	.19
Social Boldness	0.66	3.02	0.77	.01	.48
Sociability	0.72	3.23	0.83	-.21	.02*
Social Self-Esteem	0.68	3.78	0.71	-.21	.02*
Agreeableness					
Flexibility	0.57	2.85	0.69	-.04	.36
Forgiveness	0.67	2.68	0.74	-.15	.06
Gentleness	0.52	3.08	0.63	.03	.39
Patience	0.72	3.10	0.79	.08	.23
Conscientiousness					
Diligence	0.81	3.91	0.79	-.15	.06
Organization	0.81	3.67	0.98	-.11	.13
Perfectionism	0.71	3.70	0.78	-.10	.16
Prudence	0.76	3.53	0.78	.01	.44
Openness to Experience					
Aesthetic Appreciation	0.64	3.57	0.86	-.07	.24
Creativity	0.69	3.54	0.86	-.03	.38
Inquisitiveness	0.73	3.61	0.85	.15	.07
Unconventionality	0.50	3.45	0.64	.11	.13
Interstitial facet					
Altruism	0.45	3.90	0.62	-.29	.00**

Note. M and SD are used to represent the mean and standard deviation, respectively. r stands for the Pearson correlation coefficient. p stands for the probability value. * indicates $p < .05$. ** indicates $p < .01$.

Within the Honesty-Humility domain which did not correlate significantly with workplace ostracizing ($r = -.099, p = .16$) the modesty facet was observed to outperform the domain ($r = -.17, p < .05$). Comparably, two facets of Extraversion exhibit greater correlations with workplace ostracizing than their domain. Sociability exhibited a more significant negative correlation with workplace ostracizing ($r = -.21, p = .02$) while the correlation of the Extraversion domain was less strong ($r = -.17, p = .047$). The same holds true for the Social Self-Esteem facet of the same domain ($r = -.21, p = .02$). Such results highlight how the accuracy of prediction can be diminished due to the aggregation of personality facets into their constituent domains whereby trait specific, criterion valid variance is lost (Paunonen, 1998). Furthermore, regression analyses revealed that explained variance was higher when using all 24 facets ($R^2 = .30$) as opposed to all 6 domains ($R^2 = .06$). Given that the explained variance was larger for the facets, this provides additional evidence that important criterion-related variance is lost when aggregating facets to their higher-order domain.

Table 3.

Linear regression analysis results predicting workplace ostracizing with the six HEXACO domains. (N=101)

	R^2	B	$SE (B)$	β	95% CI
	0.06				
Intercept		.58	.23		
Honesty-Humility		-.03	.04	-.11	-.10, .04
Emotionality		-.03	.03	-.10	-.09, .04
Extraversion		-.06	.03	-.21	-.13, .00
Agreeableness		.00	.04	.01	-.07, .07
Conscientiousness		-.02	.03	-.06	-.07, .04
Openness to Experience		.03	.03	.10	-.03, .09

Note. B = Unstandardized regression coefficient; $SE (B)$ = standard error of B ; β = standardized beta coefficient; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B ; $F(6, 94) = 1.043, p = .40$.

Moreover, even though full masking and cancellation effects were not found among any of the domains, and no effects were found for Emotionality, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, or Openness to Experience, we did observe weak masking and cancellation effects for the Honesty-Humility and Extraversion domains. The Modesty and

Greed Avoidance facets of the Honesty-Humility domain cancelled each other out, which may have led to the resulting non-significant relation between Honesty-Humility and

Table 4.

Linear regression analysis results predicting workplace ostracizing with all 24 HEXACO-PI-R facets. (N=101)

	R^2	B	$SE (B)$	β	95% CI
	0.30				
Intercept		.54	.26		
HH fairness		-.00	.02	-.02	-.04, .05
HH greed avoidance		.02	.02	.11	-.02, .06
HH modesty		-.05	.03	-.22	-.11, .01
HH sincerity		.01	.03	.03	-.05, .06
E anxiety		.01	.03	.04	-.05, .07
E depression		-.02	.03	-.12	-.08, .03
E fear		.01	.02	.06	-.04, .06
E sentimentality		.00	.03	.00	-.05, .06
X liveliness		.02	.04	.08	-.05, .09
X social boldness		.02	.04	.10	-.05, .09
X sociability		-.03	.03	-.16	-.09, .03
X social self-esteem		-.05	.04	-.22	-.13, .02
A flexibility		-.01	.03	-.04	-.07, .05
A forgiveness		-.06	.03	-.28*	-.12, -.01
A gentleness		-.00	.03	-.01	-.07, .07
A patience		.05	.03	.22	-.02, .11
C diligence		-.05	.03	-.21	-.11, .02
C organization		.01	.03	.08	-.04, .07
C perfectionism		-.02	.03	-.08	-.08, .05
C prudence		.01	.03	.06	-.05, .07
O aesthetic appreciation		-.04	.03	-.22	-.11, .03
O creativity		.01	.03	.05	-.05, .07
O inquisitiveness		.06	.03	.28*	.00, .11
O unconventionality		.03	.03	.09	-.04, .09

Note. The interstitial Altruism facet was excluded here; B = unstandardized regression coefficient; $SE (B)$ = standard error of B ; β = standardized beta coefficient; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval for B ; * $p < .05$; $F(24, 76) = 1.385$, $p = .14$.

workplace ostracizing. Although, this cancellation effect was weak and as such may not have played a substantial role in determining whether the domain would relate significantly or not.

The apparent lack of cancellation effects among most of the HEXACO domains indicates that the formulation of the domains and their associated facets is structurally logical. A weak masking effect was found among the facets of Extraversion. Sociability and Social Self-

Esteem correlated more negatively with workplace ostracizing than Social Boldness ($z = -2.20$, $z = -1.89$ resp.). This, however, was not a full masking effect as the difference in the correlation of both Sociability and Social Self-Esteem with workplace ostracizing was not greater than the correlation of Extraversion with workplace ostracizing. As such, the effect of this masking is potentially not highly relevant.

Implications

Overall, this study stipulates that there exists a possibility for organizations and researchers alike to minimize testing time when examining specific criteria with the HEXACO while also maintaining comparable levels of criterion validity by using a few narrow facets as opposed to all of the broad domains. For example, the Social Self-Esteem and Sociability facets exhibit a significant and stronger correlation than some domains of the HEXACO, including Extraversion. Even the interstitial facet, Altruism, correlated more significantly and strongly than all six domains. Therefore, with enough research and expansion on the relations between the HEXACO and workplace ostracizing, the use of facets to predict workplace ostracizing could lead to higher utility and better efficiency in both organizational and research settings. Thus, in the future, organizations could use such information in hiring practices if they are concerned with the effects of workplace ostracizing, or as a way to inform their practices when trying to mitigate workplace ostracizing. It is crucial, however, to consider that using only facets results in lower reliabilities than using domains, and as such, interpretations based solely on facet level relations should be done with caution.

Table 5.
Masking and cancellation effects in the relations of the HEXACO-PI-R domains and facets with Workplace Ostracizing (N=101)

Domain (r)	Facet 1 (stronger r)	Facet 2 (weaker r)	Zdifference			Type
			$r_{f1-WO} > r_{f2-WO}$ [95% CI]	$r_{f1-WO} > r_{d-WO}$ [95% CI]	$r_{f2-WO} < r_{d-WO}$ [95% CI]	
Honesty-Humility (-.10)	Modesty (-.17*)	Sincerity (-.03)	-1.15 [-0.38, 0.10]	-0.76 [-0.26, 0.11]	0.87 [-0.09, 0.23]	No effect
	Modesty (-.17*)	Greed Avoidance (.10)	-2.21 [-0.51, -0.03]	-0.76 [-0.26, 0.11]	2.35 [0.03, 0.36]	Weak cancellation effect
	Modesty (-.17*)	Fairness (-.15)	-0.13 [-0.29, 0.25]	-0.76 [-0.26, 0.11]	-0.65 [-0.22, 0.11]	No effect
	Fairness (-.15)	Greed Avoidance (.10)	-1.90 [-0.51, 0.01]	-0.65 [-0.22, 0.11]	2.35 [0.03, 0.36]	No effect
	Fairness (-.15)	Sincerity (-.03)	-1.03 [-0.36, 0.11]	-0.65 [-0.22, 0.11]	0.87 [-0.09, 0.23]	No effect
	Greed Avoidance (.10)	Sincerity (-.03)	1.04 [-0.11, 0.37]	2.35* [0.03, 0.36]	0.87 [-0.09, 0.23]	No effect
Emotionality (-.07)	Dependence (-.16)	Anxiety (.00)	-1.44 [-0.40, 0.06]	-1.20 [-0.26, 0.06]	0.96 [-0.07, 0.22]	No effect
	Dependence (-.16)	Fearfulness (.08)	-1.73 [-0.51, 0.03]	-1.20 [-0.26, 0.06]	1.54 [-0.04, 0.33]	No effect
	Dependence (-.16)	Sentimentality (-.09)	-0.64 [-0.30, 0.15]	-1.20 [-0.26, 0.06]	-0.30 [-0.18, 0.13]	No effect
	Sentimentality (-.09)	Fearfulness (.08)	-1.29 [-0.42, 0.09]	-0.30 [-0.18, 0.13]	1.54 [-0.04, 0.33]	No effect
	Sentimentality (-.09)	Anxiety (.00)	-0.82 [-0.32, 0.13]	-0.30 [-0.18, 0.13]	0.96 [-0.07, 0.22]	No effect
	Fearfulness (.08)	Anxiety (.00)	-0.60 [-0.16, 0.31]	1.54 [-0.04, 0.33]	0.96 [-0.07, 0.22]	No effect
Extraversion (-.17*)	Sociability (-.21*)	Social Boldness (.01)	-2.20 [-0.41, -0.02]	-0.58 [-0.19, 0.10]	2.56 [0.04, 0.31]	Weak masking effect
	Sociability (-.21*)	Liveliness (-.09)	-1.09 [-0.35, 0.10]	-0.58 [-0.19, 0.10]	1.18 [-0.05, 0.22]	No effect
	Sociability (-.21*)	Social Self-Esteem (-.21*)	-0.03 [-0.25, 0.24]	-0.58 [-0.19, 0.10]	-0.51 [-0.19, -0.11]	No effect
	Social Self-Esteem (-.21*)	Social Boldness (.01)	-1.89 [-0.44, 0.01]	-0.50 [-0.19, 0.11]	2.56 [0.04, 0.31]	Weak masking effect
	Social Self-Esteem (-.21*)	Liveliness (-.09)	-1.29 [-0.30, 0.06]	-0.50 [-0.19, 0.11]	1.18 [-0.05, 0.22]	No effect
	Liveliness (-.09)	Social Boldness (.01)	-0.84 [-0.31, 0.12]	1.18 [-0.05, 0.22]	2.56 [0.04, 0.31]	No effect
Agreeableness (-.03)	Forgiveness (-.15)	Gentleness (.03)	-1.39 [-0.44, 0.08]	-1.43 [-0.29, 0.05]	0.70 [-0.11, 0.22]	No effect
	Forgiveness (-.15)	Flexibility (-.04)	-0.95 [-0.36, 0.13]	-1.43 [-0.29, 0.05]	-0.08 [-0.15, 0.14]	No effect
	Forgiveness (-.15)	Patience (.08)	-1.98 [-0.46, -0.00]	-1.43 [-0.29, 0.05]	1.63 [-0.02, 0.23]	No effect
	Patience (.08)	Gentleness (.03)	0.42 [-0.17, 0.27]	1.63 [-0.02, 0.23]	0.70 [-0.11, 0.22]	No effect
	Patience (.08)	Flexibility (-.04)	1.06 [-0.10, 0.32]	1.63 [-0.02, 0.23]	-0.08 [-0.15, 0.14]	No effect
	Flexibility (-.04)	Gentleness (.03)	-0.58 [-0.28, 0.15]	-0.08 [-0.15, 0.14]	0.70 [-0.11, 0.22]	No effect
Conscientiousness (-.12)	Diligence (-.15)	Prudence (.01)	-1.50 [-0.39, 0.05]	-0.50 [-0.18, 0.11]	1.71 [-0.02, 0.28]	No effect
	Diligence (-.15)	Perfectionism (-.10)	-0.48 [-0.27, 0.16]	-0.50 [-0.18, 0.11]	0.23 [-0.12, 0.15]	No effect
	Diligence (-.15)	Organization (-.11)	-0.39 [-0.25, 0.16]	-0.50 [-0.18, 0.11]	0.07 [-0.11, 0.12]	No effect
	Organization (-.11)	Prudence (.01)	-1.17 [-0.34, 0.09]	0.07 [-0.11, 0.12]	1.71 [-0.02, 0.28]	No effect
	Organization (-.11)	Perfectionism (-.10)	-0.13 [-0.20, 0.18]	0.07 [-0.11, 0.12]	0.23 [-0.12, 0.15]	No effect
	Perfectionism (-.10)	Prudence (.01)	-1.05 [-0.33, 0.10]	0.23 [-0.12, 0.15]	1.71 [-0.02, 0.28]	No effect
Openness to Experience (.05)	Inquisitiveness (.15)	Creativity (-.03)	1.70* [-0.03, 0.39]	1.44 [-0.04, 0.25]	-1.20 [-0.20, 0.05]	No effect
	Inquisitiveness (.15)	Aesthetic Appreciation (-.07)	2.10* [0.01, 0.43]	1.44 [-0.04, 0.25]	-1.95* [-0.24, 0.00]	No effect
	Inquisitiveness (.15)	Unconventionality (.11)	0.30 [-0.21, 0.28]	1.44 [-0.04, 0.25]	0.72 [-0.12, 0.25]	No effect
	Unconventionality (.11)	Creativity (-.03)	1.17 [-0.10, 0.39]	0.72 [-0.12, 0.25]	-1.20 [-0.20, 0.05]	No effect
	Unconventionality (.11)	Aesthetic Appreciation (-.07)	1.59 [-0.04, 0.41]	0.72 [-0.12, 0.25]	1.95* [-0.24, 0.00]	No effect
	Aesthetic Appreciation (-.07)	Creativity (-.03)	-0.45 [-0.22, 0.14]	-1.95 [-0.24, 0.00]	-1.20 [-0.20, 0.05]	No effect

Note. Calculations are based on the 'cocor' package for R [interpreted on the basis of Meng, Rosenthal, and Rubin (1992)]; r indicates Pearson's coefficient; z indicates Fisher's transformation; CI indicates confidence interval; f1 refers to Facet 1; f2 refers to Facet 2; d refers to Domain; WO refers to Workplace Ostracizing; '>' (resp. '<') refers to stronger (resp. weaker) correlations; classification of Type is based on 95% confidence intervals. *p < .05.

Limitations, and future research recommendations

The current study examined the correlations between the HEXACO domains and facets and workplace ostracizing along with determining the explained variance of facets versus domains through linear regressions and comparing the magnitudes between correlations in order to establish the existence of masking and cancellation effects. One strength of our overall study is that our final sample consisted of diverse individuals from different countries, ages, employment levels, and educations providing a relatively good representation of the population. A major limitation of this study, however, was the impact that the attrition rate could have potentially had on the resulting analysis. The sample size, which began at over 400 participants, was reduced to 101 after all selection criteria were processed. This small sample impacted the distribution of scores and variability in responses, which although corrected through logarithmic transformation still left some data skewed. Meaning that, while the relationship between the predictor variables (HEXACO) and the dependent variable (workplace ostracizing) was homoscedastic and no extreme violations of assumptions were found, there was a trend of lower levels of workplace ostracizing. If the sample were larger and the data was not as skewed, it would have allowed for more well-rounded and robust analyses. Nevertheless, our sample size of 101 participants should have been adequate in order to obtain an appropriate effect size and power. G*power, a statistical power analysis software (Faul et al., 2009), shows that for a power of 0.8, which is the generally accepted low threshold for power, and an effect size of 0.3 a sample size of 64 would be required for simple one-tailed correlation analyses. Another limitation of the study was that we only used a comparison of magnitudes between correlations to determine masking and cancellation effects. Further to that, we also did not account for the fact that facet level error terms are related. There are two sources that contribute to a significant correlation between a facet and the dependent variable: the unique variance of the facet being

tested and the commonality shared by all facets that make up the specific domain. Some facets would thus have both the unique and common variances relate to the outcome variable while other facets would only have the common variance do so. This creates ambiguity when interpreting the results as this effect cannot be distinguished without more complex statistical procedures. Implementing a bifactor model, which would simultaneously test the domain and facet level effects would solve these issues as it would partial out the shared characteristics among the facets when testing the distinct association between each facet and the dependent variable (Chen et al., 2012), thus providing a clearer discernment of the explained variance among facets and domains. A further limitation of this study was the use of an adapted measure for workplace ostracizing which while based on a validated measure of workplace ostracism, and maintaining adequate internal reliability, was not intended to be used from the perspective of ostracism perpetration and as such could have influenced the results of the analyses. Moreover, given the topic of our study, and the need for contact information thus lowering anonymity, social desirability could have played a role in how participants responded to both the ostracizing questionnaire and the personality measure. A further inherent issue with a study such as this is the reliance on self-report measures, which have issues associated with them that experimental research does not. Personality questionnaires, for example, have some issues with ‘faking,’ and while evidence suggests that individuals do not engage in reporting false information for personality questionnaires in high-stake situations (e.g. job application) some research implementing directed faking, has shown that people are able to fake personality questionnaires. There is however no conclusive evidence that people actually do fake in all scenarios (Cook, 2016).

A recommendation for future research would be to implement more rigorous statistical procedures (such as the aforementioned bifactor model) when evaluating masking and cancellation effects, as well as for testing hypotheses. Such research should also strive to

obtain a larger sample in order to make sure that their analyses are adequately supported as more rigorous analyses would not have been ideal in this study given the small sample size. It may also prove interesting to explore possible cultural differences with regards to probability of ostracizing, and how personality or other factors may influence that relationship. For example, given the consequences of ostracizing, differences may exist between more collectivistic and individualistic societies. Similarly, exploring potential gender differences in the probability of workplace ostracizing may reveal relevant information that could pertain to other important organizational and societal issues such as sexism. Furthermore, given the potential impact that facet level relations with criteria could have and the possibility of masking and cancellation effects within personality measurements, future research should replicate or expand upon this study with different behaviors as this will add further empirical information about the impact and existence of such relations and effects. Future research should also work on creating and validating a specific scale for measuring perpetration of ostracism in the workplace as this would provide a more well-founded and reliable measurement tool that would hopefully induce new research associated with workplace ostracizing. Finally, future research may want to try implementing non-self-report measures to determine relations between personality and workplace ostracism.

Conclusion

The results of this study show that the HEXACO is, to some extent, able to relate to workplace ostracizing meaning that some relationship exists between personality and individuals' propensity to ostracize at work. Moreover, we demonstrate how certain narrow facets are able to outperform their respective domains. Going so far as to show that using all facets reveals more explained variance in workplace ostracizing than when they are summed up as domains, affirming the old adage that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Moreover, we show how domains can mask the relations between facets, with Sociability

having a significantly stronger relation with workplace ostracizing than Social Boldness. Even further, we observed the existence of cancellation effects in the Honesty-Humility domain, further reinforcing the need to examine both domains and facets in their relations with criteria. In closing, it is clear from the results that more robust research is required in this area in order to fully comprehend the relations between personality and workplace ostracizing and what the potential implications of such research and its results could be. Given appropriate research effort, organizations and researchers of the future could optimize how they predict workplace ostracizing with the use of personality measures while retaining sufficient validity, particularly as it comes at no extra cost to either.

References

- Anglim, J., Lievens, F., Everton, L., Grant, S., & Marty, A. (2018). HEXACO personality predicts counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior in low-stakes and job applicant contexts. *Journal Of Research In Personality*, 77, 11-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2018.09.003>
- Ashton, M. (1998). Personality and job performance: the importance of narrow traits. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 19(3), 289-303. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1099-1379\(199805\)19:3<289::aid-job841>3.0.co;2-c](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1099-1379(199805)19:3<289::aid-job841>3.0.co;2-c)
- Ashton, M., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, Theoretical, and Practical Advantages of the HEXACO Model of Personality Structure. *Personality And Social Psychology Review*, 11(2), 150-166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868306294907>
- Ashton, M., & Lee, K. (2008). The HEXACO Model of Personality Structure and the Importance of the H Factor. *Social And Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(5), 1952-1962. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00134.x>
- Ashton, M., Paunonen, S., & Lee, K. (2014). On the validity of narrow and broad personality traits: A response to Salgado, Moscoso, and Berges (2013). *Personality And Individual Differences*, 56, 24-28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.08.019>
- Baumeister, R., DeWall, C., Ciarocco, N., & Twenge, J. (2005). Social exclusion impairs self-regulation. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 88(4), 589-604. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.4.589>
- Chen, F., Hayes, A., Carver, C., Laurenceau, J., & Zhang, Z. (2012). Modeling General and Specific Variance in Multifaceted Constructs: A Comparison of the Bifactor Model to

Other Approaches. *Journal Of Personality*, 80(1), 219-251.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00739.x>

Cook, M. (2016). *Personnel Selection: Adding Value Through People - A Changing Picture* (6th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Dalal, R. (2005). A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241-1255. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241>

de Vries, R., & van Gelder, J. (2015). Explaining workplace delinquency: The role of Honesty–Humility, ethical culture, and employee surveillance. *Personality And Individual Differences*, 86, 112-116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.06.008>

Diedenhofen, B., & Musch, J. (2015). cocor: A Comprehensive Solution for the Statistical Comparison of Correlations. *PLOS ONE*, 10(4), e0121945. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0121945>

Dåderman, A., & Ragnestål-Impola, C. (2019). Workplace bullies, not their victims, score high on the Dark Triad and Extraversion, and low on Agreeableness and Honesty-Humility. *Heliyon*, 5(10), e02609. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e02609>

Eisenberger, N. (2012). The pain of social disconnection: examining the shared neural underpinnings of physical and social pain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 13(6), 421-434. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3231>

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(4), 1149-1160. <https://doi.org/10.3758/brm.41.4.1149>

Ferris, D., Brown, D., Berry, J., & Lian, H. (2008). The development and validation of the Workplace Ostracism Scale. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1348.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012743>

Ferris, D., Chen, M., & Lim, S. (2017). Comparing and Contrasting Workplace Ostracism and Incivility. *Annual Review Of Organizational Psychology And Organizational Behavior*, 4(1), 315-338. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113223>

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Halevy, N., Cohen, T., Chou, E., Katz, J., & Panter, A. (2014). Mental Models at Work. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40(1), 92-110.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213506468>

Hitlan, R., & Noel, J. (2009). The influence of workplace exclusion and personality on counterproductive work behaviours: An interactionist perspective. *European Journal Of Work And Organizational Psychology*, 18(4), 477-502.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320903025028>

Hough, L. (2001). I/O owes its advances to personality. *Personality Psychology In The Workplace.*, 19-44. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10434-001>

Hough, L., & Oswald, F. (2008). Personality Testing and Industrial–Organizational Psychology: Reflections, Progress, and Prospects. *Industrial And Organizational Psychology*, 1(3), 272-290. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2008.00048.x>

Howard, M., Cogswell, J., & Smith, M. (2019). The antecedents and outcomes of workplace ostracism: A meta-analysis. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000453>

- Jahanzeb, S., & Fatima, T. (2017). How Workplace Ostracism Influences Interpersonal Deviance: The Mediating Role of Defensive Silence and Emotional Exhaustion. *Journal Of Business And Psychology*, 33(6), 779-791. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-017-9525-6>
- Jensen, J., & Patel, P. (2011). Predicting counterproductive work behavior from the interaction of personality traits. *Personality And Individual Differences*, 51(4), 466-471. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.04.016>
- Jones, E., Wirth, J., Ramsey, A., & Wynnma, R. (2018). Who Is Less Likely to Ostracize? Higher Trait Mindfulness Predicts More Inclusionary Behavior. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, 45(1), 105-119. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218780698>
- Judge, T., Rodell, J., Klinger, R., Simon, L., & Crawford, E. (2013). Hierarchical representations of the five-factor model of personality in predicting job performance: Integrating three organizing frameworks with two theoretical perspectives. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 98(6), 875-925. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033901>
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131-142. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.131>
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. (2016). Psychometric Properties of the HEXACO-100. *Assessment*, 25(5), 543-556. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191116659134>
- Leung, A., Wu, L., Chen, Y., & Young, M. (2011). The impact of workplace ostracism in service organizations. *International Journal Of Hospitality Management*, 30(4), 836-844. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2011.01.004>

- Meng, X., Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. (1992). Comparing correlated correlation coefficients. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111(1), 172-175. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.111.1.172>
- Nezlek, J., Wesselmann, E., Wheeler, L., & Williams, K. (2015). Ostracism in Everyday Life: The Effects of Ostracism on Those Who Ostracize. *The Journal Of Social Psychology*, 155(5), 432-451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2015.1062351>
- O'Reilly, J., Robinson, S., Berdahl, J., & Banki, S. (2015). Is Negative Attention Better Than No Attention? The Comparative Effects of Ostracism and Harassment at Work. *Organization Science*, 26(3), 774-793. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2014.0900>
- Ones, D., & Viswesvaran, C. (1996). Bandwidth–fidelity dilemma in personality measurement for personnel selection. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 17(6), 609-626. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1099-1379\(199611\)17:6<609::aid-job1828>3.0.co;2-k](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1099-1379(199611)17:6<609::aid-job1828>3.0.co;2-k)
- Ones, D., Viswesvaran, C., & Dilchert, S. (2005). Personality at Work: Raising Awareness and Correcting Misconceptions. *Human Performance*, 18(4), 389-404. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1804_5
- Organ, D. (2018). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Recent Trends and Developments. *Annual Review Of Organizational Psychology And Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 295-306. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104536>
- Paunonen, S. (1998). Hierarchical organization of personality and prediction of behavior. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 74(2), 538-556. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.2.538>

- Peng, A., & Zeng, W. (2016). Workplace ostracism and deviant and helping behaviors: The moderating role of 360 degree feedback. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 38(6), 833-855. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2169>
- Pletzer, J., Bentvelzen, M., Oostrom, J., & de Vries, R. (2019). A meta-analysis of the relations between personality and workplace deviance: Big Five versus HEXACO. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior*, 112, 369-383. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.04.004>
- Pletzer, J., Oostrom, J., Bentvelzen, M., & de Vries, R. (2020). Comparing domain- and facet-level relations of the HEXACO personality model with workplace deviance: A meta-analysis. *Personality And Individual Differences*, 152, 109539. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109539>
- Roberts, B., & Hogan, R. (2002). *Personality Psychology in the Workplace*. American Psychological Association.
- Rotundo, M., & Spector, P. (2017). New Perspectives on Counterproductive Work Behavior Including Withdrawal. In J. Farr & N. Tippins, *Handbook of Employee Selection* (2nd ed., pp. 476-509). Routledge.
- Rudert, S., Keller, M., Hales, A., Walker, M., & Greifeneder, R. (2019). Who gets ostracized? A personality perspective on risk and protective factors of ostracism. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000271>
- Spain, S. (2019). The Dark Side of Personality. *Leadership, Work, And The Dark Side Of Personality*, 41-93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-812821-3.00003-7>

- Tett, R., Steele, J., & Beauregard, R. (2003). Broad and narrow measures on both sides of the personality-job performance relationship. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 24(3), 335-356. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.191>
- Wesselmann, E., Wirth, J., Mroczek, D., & Williams, K. (2012). Dial a feeling: Detecting moderation of affect decline during ostracism. *Personality And Individual Differences*, 53(5), 580-586. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.04.039>
- Wesselmann, E., Wirth, J., Pryor, J., Reeder, G., & Williams, K. (2012). When Do We Ostracize?. *Social Psychological And Personality Science*, 4(1), 108-115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550612443386>
- Williams, K. (2007). Ostracism. *Annual Review Of Psychology*, 58(1), 425-452. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085641>
- Williams, K. (2007). Ostracism: The Kiss of Social Death. *Social And Personality Psychology Compass*, 1(1), 236-247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00004.x>
- Zhao, H., Peng, Z., & Sheard, G. (2013). Workplace ostracism and hospitality employees' counterproductive work behaviors: The joint moderating effects of proactive personality and political skill. *International Journal Of Hospitality Management*, 33, 219-227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.08.006>